ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 10/25/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED002341	N.A.	N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Wilber, George L.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Factors Related to the Migration of Rural Youth to Urban Areas

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: ORG. National Committee for Children and Youth, 1145 19th St. N.W. ST. CITY, STATE Washington, D.C. 20036 TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: National Committee for Children and Youth, 1145 19th St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	9/63	9

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Conference

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

rural youth	ecological factors	community factors		
migration	social factors	aspiration		
demographic factors	economic factors	migration trends		
	family factors	migration desirability		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The tendency for young Americans to achieve independence, combined with the long-established trend of rural-to-urban migration, provides a base for the migration of rural youth. The base is broadened by the processes of change which have made this country increasingly urban.

There are four factors involved in the migration of rural youth to cities each year: (1) The motives and aspirations of rural youth are instrumental to decisions to migrate. Migration is innovative when a person moves to achieve something new; it is conservative when the objective is to retain what he has. (2) Overpopulation in the home community may serve as a propelling force for rural youth, particularly those who are urban-oriented. (3) Social and economic factors influence the migration of rural youth. Foremost are employment, industrialization, technology, the business cycle, and status-aspiration. (4) The favorable or unfavorable reactions of youth to their families and communities can easily influence their decision to move.

When a decision is called for to migrate to a city or to remain in a rural area, the rural youth is a victim of circumstances. Legally he makes his own choice; in reality he is reacting to a multitude of influences about which he can do little. The rural youth, living in an economically depressed and isolated community and having parents who have instilled the desire to achieve objectives which can be satisfied only in an urban center, is almost certain to migrate. If he has been adequately equipped and prepared throughout his early years for such an eventuality, there is no problem either for him or his family. Only when his ambitions outrun his abilities and existing opportunities is he likely to encounter adjustment problems.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED002341

FACTORS RELATED TO THE MIGRATION OF RURAL YOUTH TO URBAN AREAS

by

George L. Wilber
Mississippi State University

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

National Committee for Children and Youth
1145 Nineteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

THE CENTER FOR CULTURAL STUDIES
Adams State College of Colorado
Alamosa

J0659

FACTORS RELATED TO THE MIGRATION OF RURAL YOUTH TO URBAN AREAS

by

George L. Wilber
Mississippi State University

Prepared for

The National Conference on Problems of Rural Youth
in a Changing Environment

September 1963

ED002341

FACTORS RELATED TO THE MIGRATION OF RURAL YOUTH TO URBAN AREAS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Introduction	1
Complexity of Migration	1
Migrant Rural Youth	2
Push-pull Factors	4
Social Norms and Free Migration	5
Demographic and Ecological Factors	5
Social and Economic Factors	6
Family and Community Factors	6
Norms and Aspirations of Rural Youth	6
What Rural Youth Want	6
Aspiration and Deprivation	7
Population Pressure and Socioeconomic Conditions	8
Population Pressure	8
Social and Economic Conditions	8
Social Status and Social Mobility	9
Mass Migration and Urbanization	10
Family and Community	10
Family Background and Experience	10
Community and Community Experiences	11
Some Implications	12
Footnotes	13

ABSTRACT

FACTORS RELATED TO THE MIGRATION OF RURAL YOUTH

TO URBAN AREAS

George L. Wilber

Mississippi State University

The tendency for young Americans to strike out on their own combines with the long-established trend of rural-to-urban migration to provide a broad base for the migration of rural youth. This base is broadened by the processes of change which have made this country increasingly urban.

Migration is a highly complex phenomenon, as evidenced by the number and diversity of factors put forward as explanations. The importance of factors that facilitate or impede migration depends largely on one's point of view.

To gain a better perspective of the factors involved in the migration of thousands of rural youth to cities each year, four kinds of push-pull factors are examined. First, the motives of rural youth and their aspirations are instrumental to their decision to migrate. Migration is innovating when a person moves to achieve something new and conservative when the objective is retain what he has had. Migration to cities is mass migration of other-directed persons to a very great extent. Secondly, overpopulation in the home community may serve as powerful propelling forces for rural youth, particularly those who are urban-oriented to begin with. Thirdly, a vast array of social and economic factors converge to influence the migration of rural youth. Foremost among these factors appear to be employment, industrialization, technology, the business cycle, and status-aspiration. Finally, the family and community are seen as major conditioners of youth. The favorable or unfavorable reactions of youth to their families and communities can easily influence their decision to move.

FACTORS RELATED TO THE MIGRATION OF RURAL YOUTH TO URBAN AREAS

INTRODUCTION

Americans have been migrant since the days of the early settlers from Europe. Historically, several major patterns have developed. The push westward extended through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. But the westward movement today is perhaps as much a move to urban centers as it is a westward movement. Superimposed on the westward drift of population is the continual move of rural people into urban centers. And since about the time of World War I, the movement to cities has also been a movement from South to North. This northward movement is especially relevant to any attempt to understand present trends because rural Southerners--both white and Negro--have contributed and continue to contribute literally millions of persons to northern industrial centers. Interestingly enough, the restrictions on immigration from Europe imposed in the 1920's so drastically reduced the supply of industrial labor that migrants from the South were desperately needed to fill jobs in northern factories.

Young folks expect, and often are expected to strike out on their own. Consequently it is little wonder that many rural youth leave home before they reach voting age. Essentially they are simply conforming to a pattern that has been long-established.

The major conditions related to migration to urban centers in the 1960's are not identical to those of a century ago or even 50 years ago. Living and working conditions have changed continuously, and typically at a rather rapid pace. We have become increasingly a nation of urban dwellers and of industrial and service workers employed in large-sized, bureaucratic organizations. We are strongly oriented to technological change, economic growth, and materialistic "progress." Traces of nineteenth century individualism are now mixed with demands for collective security. Reaffirmations of the principle of fair competition are diluted by numerous attempts to "get ahead at any price." There is no need to elaborate extensively on changing and present conditions, but it is important to bear in mind that it is within this broad context that we need to assess the factors relevant to the migration of rural youth.

COMPLEXITY OF MIGRATION

There is no simple straightforward explanation of migration. The complex and rapidly changing nature of our American society makes the task of explaining migration--or any other social phenomenon--difficult. Human behavior is mighty complicated, even in a relatively static society. And in our society where individuals are essentially free to make their own decisions to move without formal or governmental controls, the reasons for moving are many and diverse.

Migration research has tended to concentrate on certain aspects of migration, especially on the characteristics of migrants, major streams of migration

from one area to another, and the push-pull factors involved in migration. Characteristics investigated have been typically census-type traits such as age, sex, marital status, education, and so on. In studying streams of migration emphasis has been largely on major movements such as South-to-North and rural-to-urban. Factors that push people from one area and pull them to another have most often been defined in economic and ecological terms. It has been pointed out repeatedly, for example, that people move to take a better job or to make more money, that they move from low-income to high-income areas, and from areas of little manufacturing to areas of heavy manufacturing concentration.

In discussing migration there is often lack of agreement as to what causes persons to move and the consequences of making a given move. Honest disagreements result partly from the complex nature of migration itself, as we have just mentioned, and partly because of the different vantage points from which observers attempt to assess what is going on. If we take the hypothetical case of a young man who migrates from a farm in the South to a Northern city, we can find a number of possible interpretations as to the factors responsible for his move. One economist might see the relatively depressed conditions in the area of origin pushing the young fellow to the city where he can obtain a satisfactory job with a decent income. A psychologist might emphasize the personality of the young migrant or his motivation. From a still different point of view a political scientist might see the inability of local government units to provide adequate services to young persons in the community of origin as a key reason for moving elsewhere. A lawyer conceivably could find very limited protection of civil rights. A social worker or a policeman might find inadequately organized youth activities. A demographer perhaps would perceive population pressure in relation to limited local resources. A sociologist in turn might find the young migrant's family urging him to "make something of himself" by going to a city. It is quite possible that an element of truth resides in each of these "explanations." The most obvious point, of course, is that persons with different training and background perceive the same incident in a different way.

MIGRANT RURAL YOUTH

Any notion of abnormality about the fact that rural youth migrate can be dismissed quickly. Fewer than 10 percent in our total population have always lived in the same house. 1/ An overwhelming majority of those in their teens have moved to a different house at least once. Among the 14 to 17 year-olds, about 87 percent have moved from their original residence, and 91 percent of all 18 and 19 year-olds have moved. At age 25, 97 percent of the population one year old and over have moved to a different house at least once. Persons in their late teens--approximately at the time they might graduate from high school--move in considerable numbers. The 1950 census of population showed that 7 percent of the nearly 13 million youths between 14 and 19 years of age had moved to a different county during the preceding year. For those between 20 and 24 years of age, about 11 percent had moved to a different county.

The migration of rural youth to cities constitutes an important part of over-all migration. As many as half a million farm youths 14 to 19 years of age leave their farm homes each year. From all indications, a great many

of these youths move to cities. Table 1 shows that rural farm youth, aged 18 and 19, are more likely to move from farm to city than either the youths slightly younger or slightly older. Those in the 14 to 17 age bracket are more likely to move from one farm to another than from farm to city. Despite the rather pronounced tendency of rural youths to migrate, they are a bit less inclined to leave their homes than youths in cities.

Rural youth who migrate are like other migrants in that they tend to move shorter rather than longer distances even when they move to cities. Two-thirds of the 160,000 farm youths, 14 to 19 years of age, who moved from one State Economic Area to another in 1950, left their rural farm areas. Most of these young folks migrated within their own States. Young women were more inclined to move to cities in their home States than young men, as shown in Table 2. The young men showed a much more pronounced tendency to move greater distances or to cities in noncontiguous States. A great many of these 14 to 19 year-olds are still in school, and an undetermined number of them move with their families. There is an important distinction between those who move with, and because of, their families and those who move as individuals and leave their families behind. The youthful migrant arriving in the city on his own is likely to be without employment initially and to have little by way of monetary resources.

Table 1.

Movers From Farms, 14 to 24 Years of Age, by Type of Residence at Destination in 1950

Age	Farm residence in 1949			
	Urban and rural nonfarm in 1950		Rural farm in 1950	
	Number in thousands	Rate*	Number in thousands	Rate*
Total, 1 year old and over	1,758	7.8	1,829	8.1
14-24	489	12.2	413	10.2
14-17	130	6.9	155	8.2
18-19	128	18.1	80	11.1
20-24	231	16.4	178	12.6

*Movers as a percent of the total farm population in 1950 in each age group.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1950. Vol. IV, Part 4, Chapter C, Table 3.

Table 2.

Migrants From Farms, 14 to 19 Years of Age, by Type of Migration and Residence at Destination in 1950

Type of migration sex	Farm residence in 1949		
	Metropolitan State Economic Area in 1950	Nonmetropolitan State Economic Area in 1950	
		Urban and rural nonfarm in 1950	Rural farm in 1950
Male	100.0	100.0	100.0
Within a State	43.7	63.2	76.0
Between contiguous States	18.8	17.8	16.1
Between noncontiguous States	37.5	19.0	7.9
Female	100.0	100.0	100.0
Within a State	61.0	75.0	78.6
Between contiguous States	20.3	16.3	14.7
Between noncontiguous States	18.7	8.7	6.7

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1950. Vol. IV, Part 4, Chapter D, Table 4.

PUSH-PULL FACTORS

From among the several possible vantage points for viewing the factors that push rural youth from their homes and pull them toward cities, four major perspectives will be discussed briefly: (1) the role of social norms in determining migration, (2) demographic and ecological factors, (3) social and economic factors, and (4) family and community factors. Pursuant to consideration of these perspectives, we will examine some of the evidence relevant to each of these vantage points in the sections to follow.

SOCIAL NORMS AND FREE MIGRATION

Rural youths migrate to cities because they want to. As obvious as this simply expressed reason for moving may be, it has received relatively little attention in migration research. The usual notion of push-pull forces in migration implies that man is a sedentary creature. This is not necessarily the case. Motives and aspirations are important propelling forces. Petersen has put this more clearly than anyone in developing distinctions between kinds of migration on the basis of difference in motives. 2/ Migration is innovating, he says, when a person moves in order to achieve something new. Migration is conservative when a person moves in order to retain what he has had. In either case the desires of the individual are instrumental in determining his move. The desires in turn are related to certain standards or objectives of the individual. Aspirations for such things as income, job, education, and housing therefore assume a prominent position in the individual's decision to move.

Two classes of migration identified by Petersen are particularly relevant to our concern with rural youth. Free migration is based on the aspirations of the migrant, and his desire to migrate is decisive in determining his move. Mass migration gains its impetus from the fact that prior migration of large numbers of persons has occurred; migration becomes a style, a pattern, a social movement. The movement to urban centers in this country obviously has become a mass movement. In this sense the most difficult question is why some rural youth do not migrate to cities. The answer may rest partly with the level and nature of the individual's aspirations. In general, it appears that migration of rural youth represents a combination of free and mass migration.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECOLOGICAL FACTORS

Population analysts stress the importance of environmental and communal factors in determining migration. Some even complain that too often investigators concern themselves with motives. 3/ What is it then that makes people move? For one thing, the demographers say, overpopulation stimulates migration. Overpopulation refers to the relation of numbers of people to opportunities and facilities in an area, and as such is highly relative and likely to change quickly. Overpopulation is defined sometimes as too many persons for the jobs available. In order for overpopulation to work effectively as a stimulus there must be a condition of underpopulation in some alternative place. Also and perhaps more important, there must be knowledge of opportunities in alternative areas of residence. Such knowledge presumes effective and accurate communication.

Another factor is what Hawley calls the independent community. In the extreme case, the independent community is completely self-sufficient, its life geared to the land, and its people immobilized by virtue of the long run activities of growing and breeding. The independent community is also highly cohesive and the young folks follow the pattern set by their elders, in developing a strong attachment to the community. Consequently, the more independent the community the more successfully it restrains young persons from migrating elsewhere.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS

A vast array of things may be comprehended under the headings of social and economic factors that influence migration. Conditions of employment, industrialization, technology, housing, and wage rates have been found related to the incidence of migration. Migrants have been found to differ from non-migrants as to age, sex, marital status, education, income, employment, and color. Shifting demands for labor in various localities and ups and downs of the business cycle have been accompanied by shifting patterns of migration. Pursuit of higher social status, a factor not yet thoroughly explored in relation to migration, may be one of the more powerful forces determining migration. There is not space enough to list all of the possibilities here and to treat them systematically. It is clear, on the one hand, that a host of social and economic factors are related to migration. On the other hand, the precise role that each of the factors play and their combined influence on migration are not so clear.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY FACTORS

Both the family and the community have been recognized for a long time as exerting powerful influences on youngsters during their formative years. The family is the first group to "get a crack" at molding the youngster's personality. Consequently, many of the attitudes and habits we acquire may be traced to family influence. The values and norms, the ambitions and aspirations, and many of our basic skills derive from our family background. A youngster's relationships with his parents--either happy or unhappy--may play a distinct role in his decision to migrate. Or, a family that is closely knit may serve to deter migration.

When youngsters begin to circulate in the community, first by starting to school and later by participating in a variety of community activities, the community as a whole exerts its influence. Gradually, as youngsters gain a broader perspective from their increased range of experiences, they can assess both their family and community. By the time of high school graduation, many young folks are in a position to judge the favorable and unfavorable aspects of their family and community life. If, for example, they see their parents as dull, provincially-minded home-bodies with no ambition or worldly know-how and their community as sadly wanting in opportunities, they may quite easily conclude that their future lies elsewhere.

NORMS AND ASPIRATIONS OF RURAL YOUTH

WHAT RURAL YOUTH WANT

The rural-urban dichotomy is no longer appropriate in many ways. Similarities between rural and urban youths greatly overshadow the differences. For such reasons as the extension of transportation and communication facilities which encourage more frequent contacts and exchanges of attitudes and habits, differences have steadily leveled off. As a consequence, many rural youths have the same kinds of aspirations and ambitions as their urban counterparts. Perhaps the desire to become even more "urbanized" is a major reason for much of the migration of rural youth.

Aside from the more obvious differences between agricultural and nonagricultural ways of life, the major differences between rural and urban youth today are largely differences in socioeconomic status. Youngsters from low-income families, for instance, are about equally disadvantaged regardless of whether they live on a farm or in a city. Consequently, if we were to compare rural and urban youths with similar socioeconomic status we would find a great deal in common.

Rural youth are other-directed, to use Riesman's terminology. 4/ They seek the approval of their peers, their family, and society at large. They attempt what they think is most acceptable, most desirable, and most rewarding. And living in an urban-industrial world, they come to favor the urban way of life. To oversimplify, they want a good job, more money, and a nice place to live. For some this means getting a good education in preparation for a career, while for others--the school dropouts--this means getting a job as quickly as possible.

A survey of factors related to college attendance in 1960 5/ showed that 89 percent of the rural farm high school seniors graduated from high school, as compared with 86 percent of the urban and 91 percent of the rural nonfarm students. Among those whose fathers were farmers 92 percent graduated, a higher rate than that for white collar or manual workers. Whites more often graduated than nonwhites, and boys more often than girls. Also, those with the highest I. Q. scores and from families with the highest incomes were more likely to graduate. Fewer of the rural farm students went on to college. Only 36 percent of the rural farm students who graduated from high school in 1960 planned to attend college, and only 33 percent did attend college in 1960. The rural farm background therefore does appear to reduce the hopes of going on to college as well as the actual continuance of education. But this apparent rural-urban difference is partly an economic difference.

Rural youth are interested in getting a job as they move through this transition period from school to work. Even many of the girls today think in terms of a job or career. But the interests are not in just any job, rather in the higher prestige types of jobs. Studies of occupational prestige show that farming occupations are not nearly as popular as many of the nonfarm occupations. 6/ Professional, business, and clerical jobs are typically rated higher. Therefore, since the most highly valued jobs are typically urban we find here a powerful source of motivation for young people to move to cities. At the same time there is a tendency for many farm boys to indicate a preference for farming--and many in fact do follow the occupational footsteps of their fathers.

ASPIRATION AND DEPRIVATION

The discrepancy between what a rural youth has and what he aspires to can lead easily to dissatisfaction and frustration. A possible solution--although no guarantee--is to move to the city. This is what Petersen calls innovating migration. The youngster, who wants to be a doctor, dentist, architect, toolmaker, carpenter, sales clerk, and so on, usually is quite aware of the fact that these occupations are more abundant and their monetary rewards are great-

est in a city. Without benefit of detailed statistical information, many rural youth are perfectly aware that city jobs are likely to pay more money than farm jobs--and the statistics bear out their notions. So it goes for recreation and sports, the theatre, museums, restaurants, schools, retail stores--opportunities are greater in the city.

For the youth with less-urban kinds of aspirations, he too may find himself compelled to move. In this case the motive is primarily to maintain what he has, rather than to "get ahead." This is Petersen's conservative kind of migration. With dim prospects of buying his own farm, with increased use of farm machinery reducing the demand for his labor, and with many of his peers moving off to the city, a young fellow may feel that the best solution for him is to move to the city--not because he has a strong desire to do so, but because he feels his rural world slipping out from under him. To maintain his economic position, his friends, his life chances, he must move to the city.

POPULATION PRESSURE AND SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

POPULATION PRESSURE

Population pressure, or overpopulation, is relative, but in looking at rural areas of low-income, unemployment and underemployment, it is not uncommon to find relatively large numbers of young people moving out. 7/ Birth rates are commonly high in areas of greatest population pressure, which brings even greater pressure to bear on limited resources. In the past, cities and metropolitan areas have supplied sufficient opportunities to help siphon off what otherwise might be a surplus rural population, but they are increasingly less able to absorb large masses of imigrants, especially those who are poorly educated.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Since social, economic, and technological conditions--as well as water, electricity and other physical resources--are closely tied to population pressure, it is important to examine more carefully the role which social and economic conditions play in migration from rural areas.

Studies of net migration in the North Central States have stressed the relationship between both agricultural and industrial factors and migration. Among the factors contributing to departures from farms and rural areas are (1) a reduction in the number of farms, (2) an increase in farm mechanization, (3) a reduction in the use of hired labor on farms, (4) an increase in farm production, and (5) change in farm levels of living. The trend in each of these instances is clearly established and promises to continue indefinitely. Each of the first four contribute to outmigration, while counties with low and declining levels of living suffered most from outmigration.

The expansion of industry and the attendant increase in employment opportunities is certainly one of the distinctive factors in migration. Research again bears out the intuitive conclusion. In the North Central States, for

example, it was found that areas with heavy concentrations of manufacturing industry either retain their population or attract new migrants. Conversely, areas lacking in nonagricultural industry also lack this attracting or holding power.

The role of technological factors is not easy to assess. Experience has shown, of course, that mass production industries have generally been able to absorb technologically displaced workers--at least over the long run. Experience has demonstrated also that farm enterprises have drastically reduced need for labor as mechanization increases. But as we move more and more into the era of automation the prospects are uncertain. Pockets of severe unemployment have developed already as a result of automation. We can expect about three million persons a year to reach age 18 for each of the next several years. A very real and timely question is whether our economy can provide employment for both the workers displaced by automation and the young folks who enter the labor force. It is entirely possible that heretofore attractive urban centers will lose much of their lustre and much of their promise for rural youth who find the job they wanted occupied by an electronic machine. Most of us, however, like to remain optimistic enough to think that new products, new industries, increased industrial production and increased expansion in service industries will somehow provide the necessary jobs.

We have not had a recurrence of the economic conditions of the 1930's, and perhaps will never again experience such a deep economic depression. The less severe ups and downs of the business cycle nevertheless affect the migration of rural youth. Much of the short-term back-and-forth movement between rural areas and urban centers is closely geared to economic conditions. The rural youth who loses his job in the city often returns home to await improved employment prospects. These broad and fundamental economic and technological conditions are essentially beyond the control of the individual youth. Thus, there is a continuous threat of disequilibrium in the employment arena which may become very troublesome for the youth attempting to reconcile the discrepancy between his aspirations and his achievements.

SOCIAL STATUS AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

The tendency of Americans to seek to improve their lot is well known. Vance Packard popularized the notion of status-seekers. W. L. Warner stressed the fact that many of us hold the "American Dream" of getting ahead. C. Wright Mills pointed up the changing nature of our class structure and the rise of a new middle class, a landless class.

Surprisingly enough there has been a noticeable shortage of research specifically focused on the connection of class mobility and migration. Much of the literature has implied nevertheless that movement up the social ladder is associated with migration. In fact much of the research on migration from rural to urban centers leaves this impression.

One of the more clear-cut efforts to relate mobility and migration was a recent study in Indiana. 8/ Job mobility and migration were compared in both high- and low-income rural communities. In general it appeared that dual mobility--job and residential--was higher among younger persons (31-42 years

of age) and those with a college education. Dual mobility also seemed to depend on status level--i.e., high status persons were more often both job mobile and migrant. The results of this study are not conclusive and rural youth themselves were not subject to analysis. Therefore the fairly strong prospect of social status and social mobility being important to migration must await the affirmation of additional research.

MASS MIGRATION AND URBANIZATION

The facts that large numbers of our population have moved from rural to urban areas and that our society has become increasingly urban are well known. These are so well known that no further elaboration is required at this point.

At the same time it is important to reemphasize that the conditions of mass migration and urbanization are fundamental in any attempt to explain why young people migrate to cities. It is easy to imagine that were these two conditions removed--or drastically reduced--that there would be far less movement to urban centers than we now find.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

FAMILY BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

As a youngster moves through his teens the totality of his prior family life plays an important part in how he thinks, what he believes, and how he behaves. His reaction to his family may range from a belligerent rebellion to a warm-hearted acceptance. He may want to escape the family, and particularly the parental influence, as quickly and completely as possible, or he may want to continue a close, comforting, and perhaps convenient relationship. Out of the myriad of family influences, experiences, and reactions, three are singled out here for special emphasis.

In the first place, the "social health" of the family can have a strong influence on a youngster and his decision to move away. Social health refers to the family as seen by the youngster rather than as seen by an outsider. A family may be seen as unhealthy for a variety of reasons, including death or divorce in the family, constant bickering and strife, or simply that the family is burdened by poverty to the extent that youngsters see no hope of improvement. Healthiness of the family is a matter primarily of the youngster's sense of happiness with his family. His "definition of the situation" as happy or unhappy is what really counts. With the usual but necessary qualification of "other things being equal," it is quite clear that youngsters are likely to leave what they regard as an unhappy home. Conversely, they are likely to feel a sense of attachment and desire to remain in a happy home.

Secondly, family cohesion serves to deter migration. 9/ The cohesion, unity, or solidarity of a family exists regardless of the happiness or unhappiness of individual members. Cohesion is most apparent during times of crisis, such as death, illness, or unemployment in the family. Rural families are perhaps more nearly bound together by cohesion than urban families, at least in such a way as to help deter migration. Family cohesion may very well be

the factor that postpones or prevents migration of some rural youth who otherwise have all the reason in the world to head for the city.

Intertwined with family health and cohesion--not to mention the many other family factors--is the fact that the family serves as a source of stimulation, incentive or motivation. In addition to transmitting moral standards, skills, and habits, parents can help incite a child to be ambitious, to better himself. The nature and levels of aspiration instilled in the child in turn help determine where he must go or where he must be to seek satisfaction. 10/

COMMUNITY AND COMMUNITY EXPERIENCES

Lastly, we come to the community within which rural youth live and its influence on their migration. A number of aspects of the community must be taken into account--the popularity of the community, availability of various facilities, geographical location, and prospects for growth and prosperity. The continuous volume of migration from rural communities suggests a lack of popularity for the rural as compared with the urban community. Undoubtedly, this strain toward urbanism has had its influence in a society of many other-directed persons. A small and diminishing number of persons still feel that farm work and life in a rural community are the most desirable, but in so doing they run counter to major societal trends.

Closely related to the desirability or popularity of the rural community is the question of community resources and facilities. No small town or hamlet can possibly provide the range and depth of services found in our larger metropolitan areas. Some of the more essential and general services--schools, churches, stores, and a community hospital--may be conveniently accessible, but for an art school, a furrier, or a pediatrician the rural resident most likely will have to travel to some urban center. Many rural communities have tried to fill the void by organizing various clubs and associations. Farm Bureaus, 4-H clubs, Future Farmers, and American Legion baseball may help satisfy many of the needs, but they simply do not serve as adequate substitutes for the much greater range of activities in the typical city. Again, of course, it is the judgment of rural youth which is decisive in determining whether a given community's facilities are adequate or not in relation to alternatives elsewhere.

Accessibility of larger towns and cities in terms of time and distance is an important factor in migration. In a study of rural young people in Pennsylvania it was found that many did not migrate because they were located conveniently to sources of employment and because of the lengthening commuting radius afforded by improved roads. 11/ Thus rural youth in relatively urbanized areas have less need to move away than those in more remote locations. But even rural youth in relatively urban regions must find satisfactory opportunities for employment, recreation and the like or they too may feel compelled to move. Consequently, rural youth are in constant need of assessing the prospects of the communities and regions within which they reside.

SOME IMPLICATIONS

When it comes to migrating to a city or remaining in a rural area, rural youth is largely a victim of circumstances. While he is legally free to move or not move, he is subject to a great many pushes and pulls. In the immediate sense he makes his own choice, but in reality he is reacting to a multitude of interrelated influences which, by and large, he can do little about.

The rural youth living in an economically depressed and isolated community whose parents have instilled the desire to achieve objectives that can be satisfied only in an urban center is virtually certain to migrate. If he has been adequately equipped and prepared throughout his early years for such an eventuality, there is no particular problem for either him or his family. Only when his ambitions outrun his abilities and existing opportunities is he likely to encounter difficult adjustment problems.

The consequences of rural youth leaving their homes and communities are neither inherently desirable or undesirable. Desirability depends on one's point of view in relation to the particular circumstances. Parents who want their son who left for the city to take over the family farm obviously react differently from parents who want their son to become a city planner. Residents of the community may feel a loss if they respect the ability and potential of the youths who depart. Migrants themselves may view their departure as most desirable from their own personal point of view.

FOOTNOTES

1 See U. S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports. Population Characteristics. "Mobility of the Population of the United States, April 1958 to 1959." Series P-20, No. 104, September 30, 1960.

2. Petersen, William. "A General Typology of Migration." American Sociological Review, June 1958, 23, 256-266.

3 Hawley, Amos H. Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure, New York: Ronald Press, 1950, p. 328.

4 Riesman, David. et al., The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953, pp. 32-48.

5 U.S. Bureau of the Census. Farm Population. "Factors Related to College Attendance of Farm and Nonfarm High School Graduates: 1960." Series Census-ERS (P-27), No. 32, June 15, 1962.

6 National Opinion Research Center, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," Opinion News, September 1, 1947, 9, 3-13.

7 See Jehlik, Paul J. and Wakely, Ray E. Population Change and Net Migration in the North Central States, 1940-50, Ames: Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Bulletin 430, July 1955, and Rural-Urban Migration in Iowa, 1940-50. Ames: Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Bulletin 407, April 1954. For a similar view see Hagood, Margaret and Sharp, Emmit F. Rural-Urban Migration in Wisconsin, 1940-50, Madison: Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Bulletin 176, August 1951.

8 Olson, Philip G. Job Mobility and Migration in a High Income Rural Community, Lafayette: Indiana Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Bulletin No. 708, November 1960; Geschwind, R. D. and Ruttan, V.W. Job Mobility and Migration in a Low Income Rural Community, Lafayette: Indiana Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Bulletin No. 730, September 1961.

9 Eugene Litwak advances the notion that extended family relations can be maintained despite migration because institutional pressures force the family to legitimize migration, because technological improvements in communication have minimized the disruptive forces of distance, and because an extended family can provide help to nuclear families without interfering with the occupational system. See his "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." American Sociological Review, June 1960, 25, 385-394.

10. One of the more recent indications of how parents affect the aspirations of their children is in Morgan, James N., et al. Income and Welfare in the United States, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962, pp. 371-383.

11. Brown, C. Harold and Buck, Roy C. Factors Associated With Migrant Status of Young Adult Males from Rural Pennsylvania, University Park: Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 676, January 1961.